UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United	l States of America,).	Case No. CR	3-17-70544 JJ
	Plaintiff, v.))).		ORDER EXCLUDING TIME SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
La	apine Feation Defendant.)))		
	Defendant.)	_	
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on 4/18, 2016, the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act from 4/18, 2016 to 4/25, 2016 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):				
Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).				
	The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).			
	Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).			
		se commitments, t		ndant continuity of counsel, given the exercise of due diligence.
<u>X</u>	Failure to grant a continuance necessary for effective preparage 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(E	ration, taking into		
	IT IS SO ORDERED.			
D A TEI	z. 4/18/17			
DATEI); 		JOSEPH C. SPI	ERO
	1	_	Chief Magistrat	e Judge
STIPUI	LATED: MA Z	7	Lan	4.10
	Attorney for Defend	lant	Assistant Unite	FILED
	\bigcup			APR 18 2017
			1	SUSAMM SCONG CLERK, O. 1. TRICT COURT IORTHERN DUTAICT OF CALIFORNIA